



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,917	12/11/2003	Joseph Michael Christie	1098e	8496
28004	7590	01/11/2008		
SPRINT			EXAMINER	
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY			PARK, JUNG H	
KSOPHT0101-Z2100				
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2619	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,917

Applicant(s)

CHRISTIE ET AL.

Examiner

Jung Park

Art Unit

2619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Doshi et al. (US 6324179, "Doshi").

**Regarding claim 1**, Doshi discloses a telecommunication processing system comprising:

- a first signaling interface (a port, see 241 fig.6) configured to receive a first signaling message (extract signaling information such as dialed digits, see col.8, ln.54-55) from a narrowband network element (LEC, see 325 fig.6);

- a message handler (a signal processor, see 240 fig.6 and col.8, ln.54-60) configured process the first signaling message to recognize a trigger (extract dialed digits, see col.8, ln.54-60), identify a communication service responsive to the trigger (response to signals, see col.8, ln.54-60), obtain data to implement the communication service (collects the data, see col.8, ln.54-60), and process the data to generate a route instruction (address of switch for routing, see col.8, ln.65-67);

- a second signaling interface (an interface, see 157 fig.6) configured to transfer a second signaling message (IAM message, see col.8, ln.59-61) indicating the route instruction to a packet network element (address of ATM switch, see col.8, ln.66), wherein the packet network element receives the second signaling message (process

IAM message, see col.9, ln.1), receives user communications transferred from the narrowband network element (conversation between S1 and S2 after call-setup connection, see fig.6), and transfers the user communications over a packet network responsive to the second signaling message (conversation over the packet network response after processing IAM message, see fig.6, col.8, 30-col.9, ln.37); and

- wherein the first signaling interface (241 fig.6), the second signaling interface (157 fig.6), and the message handler (240 fig.6) are external to the narrowband network element (external to LEC as shown in fig.6), the packet network element (ATM switches, see 154 & 155 fig.6), and other network elements that transfer the user communications (225, 235, & 300 fig.6).

**Regarding claim 11**, it is a method claim corresponding to the system claim 1 and is therefore rejected for the similar reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi.

Regarding claim 2, Doshi does not explicitly disclose the limitation in Figure 6, but Figure 1 discloses, "wherein the first signaling interface comprises a signaling system seven interface (SS7 signaling interface, see col.3, ln.60-64)." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's

invention to apply SS7 interface between LEC CO and ATM switch in order to operate in a STM to transport speech signals associated with a particular call over a circuit-switched connection in digital form (col.4, ln.4-8).

Regarding claim 12, Doshi does not explicitly disclose the limitation in Figure 6, but Figure 1 discloses, "wherein the first signaling message comprises a signaling system seven initial address message (IAM message, see col.4, ln.52-54)." This claim is rejected for the same reasons and motivation set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

5. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Boese et al. (US 5084816, "Boese").

Regarding claim 3, Doshi lacks what Boese discloses, "further comprising a third signaling interface (an interface related to SCP database, see fig.1 and col.1, ln.29-47) configured to transfer a third signaling message (a querying signal to SCP database, see, see col.1, ln.29-47) to a database and receive a fourth signaling message from the database (a return message from the database, see col.1, ln.29-47), wherein the fourth signaling message indicates the data to implement the communication service (col.1, ln.40-47)." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to apply the SCP taught by Boese into the system of Doshi in order to have databases contain a "customer record" which specifies how each 800 call is to be routed. The motivation of using the database is to have more information in accordance with the time of day, day of month, originating numbering plan area of the caller or other pre-defined method for providing quick service to users.

Regarding claim 4, Doshi lacks what Boese discloses, "wherein the third signaling interface comprises a signaling system seven transaction capability application part interface (TCAP, see 780 fig.9A and col.30, ln.51-col.31, ln.5)." This claim is rejected for the same reasons and motivation set forth in the rejection of claim 3 since TCAP protocol is used in an SS7 network for sending database queries to a service control point (SCP) and the SCP provides the interface to local and remote databases that contain subscriber and routing information.

Regarding claim 6, Doshi lacks what Boese discloses, "wherein the second signaling interface comprises an Ethernet interface (Ethernet, see 660 fig.6, col.22, ln.57-68)." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to apply the Ethernet interface taught by Boese into the system of Doshi in order to connect computers in a company or home network for Internet access. The motivation is to have standard protocol compliance because it is a standard local area network (LAN) access method.

Regarding claim 7, Doshi lacks what Boese discloses, "wherein the data to implement the communication service comprises N00 service data (800 number, see col.1, ln.48-55)." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to apply the N00 service data taught by Boese into the system of Doshi in order for businesses provide clients and others with a means of communicating with them at no charge since the toll-free telephone numbers are a staple of business efforts to garner new customers and retain existing ones.

Regarding claims 13, 14, 16, and 17, they are claims corresponding to claims 3, 4, 6, & 7, respectively and are therefore rejected for the similar reasons set forth in the rejection of the claims.

6. Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Boese and further in view of Hollenbach et al. (US 5533115, "Hollenbach").

Regarding claim 5, Doshi and Boese lack what Hollenbach discloses, "wherein the second signaling interface comprises an internet protocol interface (IP interface, see 136 fig.3 and col.5, ln.19-27)." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to apply the IP interface taught by Hollenbach into the system of Doshi and Boese in order to provides the service of communicable unique global addressing amongst computers since IP a data-oriented protocol for communicating data across a packet-switched network and IP can be used over a heterogeneous network (i.e., a network connecting two computers can be any mix such as ATM, Ethernet, etc.) and it makes no difference to the upper layer protocols.

Regarding claim 15, it is a claim corresponding to claim 5 and is therefore rejected for the similar reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

7. Claims 8-10 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doshi in view of Fischell et al. (US 5394463, "Fischell").

Regarding claim 8, Doshi lacks what Fischell discloses, "wherein the data to implement the communication service comprises Virtual Private Network (VPN) service data (VPN, see col.1, ln.11-28)." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to apply the VPN taught by Fischell into the system of Doshi in order to provide additional services so that they receives directly any trigger that is entered by the party they are serving, i.e., calling or called party (Fischell, col.9, ln.28-31).

Regarding claim 9, Doshi lacks what Fischell discloses, "wherein the data to implement the communication service comprises dialed number service data (col.1, ln.11-28), but not mobility. However, the examiner takes official notice that at the time of invention, mobile communications have been found to be of great value to station users who roam large geographic areas yet who desire immediate access to telephone services, especially in critical situations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to apply the dialed number mobility service data in order to provide a better service for mobile users. This claim is rejected for the same reasons and motivation set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

Regarding claim 10, Doshi lacks what Fischell discloses, "wherein the route instruction is for a voice message platform (col.1, ln.11-28)." This claim is rejected for the same reasons and motivation set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

Regarding claims 18-20, they are claims corresponding to claims 8-10, respectively and are therefore rejected for the similar reasons set forth in the rejection of the claims.



8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


**Conclusion**

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jung Park whose telephone number is 571-272-8565. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri during 6:15-3:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on 571-272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JP  
Jung Park  
Patent Examiner

  
HASSAN KIZOU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600